

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

January 16, 2001

5:30 PM

Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Gatsas, Pariseau, Thibault, Hirschmann, O'Neil

Messrs: M. Normand, Deputy Solicitor Arnold, M. Daneault, Atty. Rich,
J. Farrell

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Mr. Joseph Carringer of Joe Hemp Production wishes to appeal the denial of the Entertainment Place of Assembly License application for the Hemp Fashion Symposium to be held on Saturday, February 10, 2001 at the Center of NH.

Alderman Pariseau asked how was this taken care of.

Mr. Normand answered what we did was in working with the Police Department we placed conditions on his license. The problem was he wanted to do public dancing after 2 AM, which as we all know by now the ordinance prohibits. We were able to basically, through conditions...there will not be dancing after 2 AM. They are going to do a fashion show, which is acceptable under the ordinance so that has been resolved with the approval of the Police Department and the Solicitor's Office.

Alderman Pariseau stated I have a problem with...I don't know in reading this I think it might be drug related only making reference to that Joe Hemp. Now I know that hemp is another synonym for marijuana or whatever it is. That is my concern. Why would we even approve that?

Mr. Normand replied I can assure you that the Chief had reservations initially and Mr. Joe Carringer was investigated and they felt comfortable with issuing that license for that activity.

Alderman Hirschmann asked this is a fashion show. They walk up and down and show clothes or what?

Mr. Normand answered exactly. It is clothes made of hemp. Essentially, the permit was not denied because they didn't apply for the dancing after 2 AM so there was no need to deny it. There will be no dancing. There are understood and signed conditions stating such.

Alderman Pariseau asked what are the hours of this operation. Are they going to go beyond 2 AM with the fashion show?

Mr. Normand answered there is going to be a fashion show...

Alderman Pariseau interjected after 2 AM.

Mr. Normand replied yes.

Alderman Pariseau asked until when.

Mr. Normand answered 5 AM.

Alderman Pariseau asked why are we allowing that when we haven't allowed it in the past.

Mr. Normand answered because the ordinance doesn't allow for us to...the Solicitor's Office made a decision today and it does not prohibit any other activity except public dancing so we were unable to...

Alderman Pariseau interjected so you are telling me that if we have a rave down at that place there in the Millyard that if people are just going to listen to music they can stay there until 5 AM.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded under the present ordinance, yes. The present ordinance forbids dancing. It doesn't forbid other activities.

Alderman Thibault asked are we setting precedence here.

Chairman Gatsas answered yes.

Mr. Normand stated I spoke with Deputy Robinson and we are going to certainly put something together that the Solicitor's Office is comfortable with. We are going to put an ordinance together so that we can...I think the Police Department feels uncomfortable with any kind of activity after 2 AM...entertainment or stuff

like that which is what is being done so we are going to put an ordinance together to address the issue.

Alderman Thibault asked if something happens between now and when we pass this ordinance, we are setting a precedent where other places could, in fact, do this before the ordinance passes correct. I have a problem with that. Aren't we setting ourselves up? That is what I am looking at.

Chairman Gatsas answered obviously if the Police Department has looked at this and has addressed it, they certainly write a much tighter ship than we ever thought of writing here so if they are looking at it and saying they don't have a problem with it, obviously normally we take testimony from them before we make a decision in this Committee. They are coming back and saying the ordinance says that they can do it as long as there is no public dancing.

Alderman Thibault replied the question I am asking is in between now and when we draft a new ordinance, which they say we must do if I hear your right to protect us...

Clerk Bernier interjected if that is the wish of this Committee.

Alderman Thibault stated that is what I am saying. The Police Department, although they are letting this go, are concerned about other problems. Am I hearing you right?

Mr. Normand replied absolutely. The only way that we will have the tools to prevent this activity after 2 AM is to write a new ordinance according to the Solicitor's Office so we need to put an ordinance together to get that written.

Alderman Thibault asked how fast can that happen.

Mr. Normand answered within two to three months.

Alderman Thibault stated well I am a little worried about that.

Chairman Gatsas stated we can't stop this as it is right now.

Alderman Pariseau asked why can't we.

Chairman Gatsas answered the Solicitor says we can't.

Alderman Pariseau stated we can deny a license. My concern is that here we have this Sunday ordinance. This will go from, I don't know when it starts on Saturday,

February 10 going until at least 5 AM on a Sunday. I think that in itself would be in violation of the Sunday ordinance.

Mr. Normand replied what is prohibited is public dancing and they have applied for entertainment place of assembly. Because they are not dancing, there is no availability for us to deny that license.

Alderman Pariseau asked but coming to this Committee or coming to this City for a license under the auspicious of the Center of New Hampshire is okay. What does the Center of New Hampshire's business license say?

Mr. Normand answered well I think the Solicitor's Office felt that the activity was Joe Hemp Productions, not the Center of New Hampshire, but certainly Mr. Arnold is here and can answer that.

Alderman Pariseau asked if this Joe Hemp Productions was located at another location, I am sure that the Police Department would not have approved it. In fact, I would guarantee you that they wouldn't have approved it.

Mr. Normand answered it is not the location, Alderman, it is the ordinance the way it is written currently.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated it is the activity that the ordinance regulates.

Alderman Hirschmann asked how many police are going to be at this function. How many are hired?

Mr. Normand answered five total officers. One supervisor and four police officers.

Alderman Hirschmann asked so five all together.

Mr. Normand answered yes.

Alderman Hirschmann asked and if there is something illegal going on they are going to shut this thing down.

Mr. Normand answered right and they were made...believe me it was made quite clear...I spoke with them at 4:30 PM this evening and they know that no dancing is allowed. If a group of people break out and conduct any kind of activity contrary to the ordinance, it will be revoked. The doors will be shut.

Alderman Hirschmann stated being on this Committee for a lot of years, we have turned down many, many licenses over the years. Now what is to stop 100 people from staying in one of the bars in town and locking the door behind them and staying there all night long? This is a bad, bad precedent here.

Chairman Gatsas replied there is a State law that says you can't serve liquor.

Alderman Hirschmann responded but they can loiter in there and do who knows what. We have always tried to close everything down at 1 AM. No dancing, no loitering, no nothing. Go home. Bad things happen after 2 AM.

Chairman Gatsas asked is there an ordinance that says they can't be open.

Mr. Normand answered no. The only...

Chairman Gatsas interjected if there is no liquor being served.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated there may be State statutes. There are certainly State statutes dealing with...

Chairman Gatsas interjected is there a City ordinance that says that a bar can't stay open after 1 AM if they are not serving liquor.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I don't believe so.

Mr. Normand stated no.

Alderman Hirschmann stated next week you are going to have that Club Kraze down in the Millyard come here and say that they are going to stay open until 5 AM and they are just going to loiter around and not dance too. One by one you will have hundreds of these nightclubs all over town. We should make an amendment in the Committee and change the ordinance with the snap of a finger, not three months.

Clerk Bernier asked is it the wish of this Committee to draft an ordinance similar to what Alderman Hirschmann said.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to amend the ordinance to not allow this to happen. 1 AM is the cut off. I don't care if you are loitering, go home. The Solicitor can help word it.

Chairman Gatsas asked what is the position of the Solicitor on where we are with this item right now.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered the license has been issues. There were not grounds to deny it. I think that this particular item has been addressed and there is no action required by the Committee other than maybe receive and file this communication. If the Committee, as it appears, has a desire to amend the ordinance I understand the Police Department is working on that and we can certainly make them aware that this Committee would like some priority placed on that and we could work hopefully to get it for if not the next Board meeting the Board meeting after. I hope I have answered your question.

Alderman Thibault asked are we saying that we cannot stop this from happening. Is that what we are saying? We can't stop it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered that is correct. I don't believe there is an ordinance in place that allows you...

Alderman Thibault interjected if this Committee says right now that we don't want this to happen, it is going to happen anyway.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I don't think that there is authority on behalf of this Committee at this point to deny the license that has been requested.

Alderman Hirschmann stated but until the ordinance is fixed can we make a motion to make the permit a very high fee for loitering between 1 AM and 5 AM. Leo, is there anything that we can do with the fee? Not for this particular one, but for the next 10 that are coming?

Mr. Normand replied they have not been issued a license as of this date. They have not.

Clerk Bernier stated to answer Alderman Hirschmann in regards to the fee, you would have to amend the ordinance and then you have to make sure that it covers the cost. You can't really make it so exorbitant.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated you can't make the fee punitive. You can make it cover your enforcement and other costs.

Chairman Gatsas stated I have to believe that there are maybe two or three sentences in the ordinance that have to be changed. That should be able to be done by the next Board of Aldermen meeting. Maybe we can get a motion out of this Committee that we will waive it coming back to this Committee and let it go to the full Board.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to have the ordinance amendment submitted to the full Board. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Clerk Bernier asked you want us to bring it to the January 23 meeting.

Chairman Gatsas answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated I agree with my colleagues. We have been very cautious about these all night events. I think we have been very consistent. When we were a little liberal with it, it came back to bite us. I think this is just somebody finding a way around the law and I think it sets a very bad precedent. I don't know who made the statement earlier, but the craziest things always seem to happen between 2 AM and 5 AM in this City. I don't think any of us are suggesting that we want an inactive City, but certainly I don't know that these events going on from 2 AM until 5 AM are appropriate.

Alderman Pariseau asked, Matt, why didn't we get a complete package dealing with this application other than just a...

Mr. Normand interjected there is no application. They were passing the application around for approval today and it was going to be denied based on what they were conducting and through stipulations and conditions placed on by the Police Department they were comfortable with the fact that they would not be allowed to dance after 2 AM. The whole problem here was that they had invested money into the Center of New Hampshire without checking with us first and when they talked to me I told them look you can't do this. This cannot be done and they were not aware of the ordinance so they wanted to come before this Committee and the only opportunity for them to do that before February 10 was tonight. By resolving that today, we were able to, we thought, take it off the agenda so that you wouldn't have to deal with it.

Alderman Pariseau asked do we have any information on this Joseph Carringer and/or Joe Hemp Productions. I don't understand why they are here in Manchester. Why don't they go to Nashua where he is from?

Mr. Normand answered the Police Department, as I said, they received their application and conducted an investigation on Mr. Carringer.

Alderman Pariseau asked can we request information from the Nashua Police Department relative to Joe Hemp Productions before next week's meeting.

Mr. Normand answered sure.

Chairman Gatsas asked do we need to make a motion to suspend the rules for this to go to the full Board.

Clerk Bernier answered no.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to submit the ordinance amendment to the full Board instead of having it come back to this Committee. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Matt, are they hiring the usual police complement for the size crowd that they are anticipating.

Mr. Normand answered when I talked to Deputy Chief Robinson he felt that they were probably hiring more than they needed.

Alderman O'Neil asked what about the Fire Department.

Mr. Normand answered they are hiring one officer from the Fire Department and that is standard.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess when we get these things we seem to get either no information or very little information and I think we talked about that before that we want some information from the Police Department on these events. We found out some lingerie show that we passed last year that there was a problem and nobody ever said a word to us about it. I think we need to, if you can convey that to the Police Department, we need to get information on these events.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Contributory Retirement System submitting a revision of Chapter 218, the Systems Plan Document.

Mr. Daneault stated I am the Executive Director of the City of Manchester Retirement System. With me is Attorney John Rich from the McLane & Graf Law Firm. I guess I should start by just explaining to you that I have never been through this process before so the information that you have before you including the plan restatement is basically for informational purposes. At some point in time, we anticipate, the Board anticipates processing this rewritten plan document through the Legislature after which it will come back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and then be placed on a ballot for a referendum vote. I think that is the process.

Clerk Bernier replied that is correct.

Mr. Daneault stated the reason for restating the plan document, a document that has been in existence since 1974, was to bring it up-to-date in compliance with Internal Revenue Regulations to make it a little bit clearer to read, to redefine some of the terminology in the documents, and there is a document that was distributed to you this afternoon that gives a summary of the purposes for restating the plan document. I need to add that this is sort of a moving target. There are still some issues that need to be discussed with the Board of Trustees, but for all intents and purposes, this restatement is not intended to modify any plan benefits. It is simply intended to clarify the document. The restatement will have no contributory cost to the City of Manchester and it is not intended to do that. The restatement is intended to first off identify the plan's tax qualification status. The plan is qualified under Internal Revenue regulations or Code Section 401A. The old plan document or the existing plan document does not stipulate that in the document itself. The restatement, if you look through it, now does add that language. We have added definitions to some of the terminology used in the document. In a lot of cases there were words used in the document that were used with a double meaning and in order to try to alleviate any legal challenges later on or any potential court litigation we have added definitions to the document. It also codified service buy back provisions. The current document allows service buy backs for three different purposes. For military leave, authorized leave of absence by the City and for the purchase of prior withdrawn service. An employee who leaves City government withdraws contributions and comes back later on can then repurchase that service. However, there was some service that historically has been allowed to be repurchased, other City service. There was legitimate service, but the plan document didn't really allow for the purchase of that service and nevertheless it was being done and has been done for years. So, we have codified that in the restatement of the plan document. It also provides for the succession of beneficiary payments. In the case of a member's death prior to...if a member was not eligible for retirement benefits there is a provision for a refund of contributions to a beneficiary. There were no provisions in there in the event that the member had not left proper instructions for that beneficiary designation.

Chairman Gatsas asked Atty. Rich has this been submitted to the IRS and approved and accepted.

Atty. Rich answered it has never been submitted to the IRS. That is one of the items that the Board of Trustees will take care of following amendment to the plan. Under...you don't necessarily have to submit a plan for IRS approval.

Chairman Gatsas asked what about ARISA.

Atty. Rich answered the federal labor law called ARISA does not apply to this plan because it is a governmental plan and ARISA specifically exempts governmental plans.

Chairman Gatsas asked do you need a motion here.

Clerk Bernier stated you don't need a motion. He just wanted to explain the document.

Alderman O'Neil stated there seems to have been over the years some little problems. Does this clean up a lot of those little problems? Some had to do with whether or not it just needed Board approval or whether or not it had to go to referendum and I even remember some concerns about whether or not it needed to be approved by the Legislature and I know that was previous to you becoming the director. Does this clean up a lot of those problems?

Mr. Daneault replied there were referendums that were approved without legislative approval in the past. That was all cleaned up in 1999 through the Legislature. This will be taken care of correctly through the legislative process.

Alderman O'Neil stated you said this would not hurt any of the current benefits. Does it improve any of the benefits in any way?

Mr. Daneault replied I don't know if I want to say it improves benefits. In one section it redefines average final earnings. Currently when a member retires the three highest years that are allowed to calculate average final earnings are taken from the highest calendar years. What that does if a member retires any time prior to January 1, that member will lose all salary credits for the most recent months of service. For example, if somebody retires on July 1, they will get no salary credit from the salary earned from January through July 1. What this will do is go back to the system that was used in the past where they used all of the most current salary because the definition of earnings in the document allowed for a member to select his three highest years to make the benefit the greatest that he could make it. Does that answer your question?

Alderman O'Neil stated on the first page of the summary you indicated and I don't want to put words in your mouth but I thought you said it cleaned up the beneficiary section of it. That to me sounded like it might make a better situation for the surviving spouse.

Mr. Daneault replied yes. For example, it adds a payment to an estate provision in the event that the beneficiary is no longer surviving. This way we can automatically make the payment to the State. Otherwise, there was no provision.

Alderman Lopez asked who in the City would sign off on this document to make sure that the City is protected in reviewing this.

Mr. Daneault answered it will come back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen after it goes through the Legislature and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, as I understand it, have to approve it so that it can then go to a referendum vote.

Alderman Lopez stated my question is who in the City would get it and review it. Would it be our City attorney to make sure that everything is okay?

Mr. Daneault replied that would be up to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Chairman Gatsas stated I would assume it is going to the City. The legislature is where it is going to be the final document that is going to come to this Board.

Alderman Lopez asked and then you would approve it.

Chairman Gatsas answered I don't think this Committee needs to approve it. I think it is just a formality because it has to go on the ballot.

Alderman Lopez stated I know it has to go on the ballot but are we doing it backwards. Is that the normal procedure? The City hasn't looked at this document or signed off on it before it goes to the State.

Atty. Rich stated the City's Finance Director is a member of the Board of Trustees.

Alderman Lopez asked our Finance Director.

Atty. Rich answered yes. Kevin Clougherty is a member of the Board.

Alderman Lopez asked does he sign off on this document.

Atty. Rich answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked is there any problem over at the Retirement Board that we should know about currently.

Mr. Daneault answered I am not sure what you are referring to.

Alderman Lopez asked there are no charges or money missing or anything like that.

Mr. Daneault answered I am not really allowed to comment on that, but there is an investigation going on. That was prior to my time.

Alderman Lopez asked does our City Solicitor know about it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I am not personally aware.

Mr. Daneault stated the Mayor does. He is on the Board of Trustees. Let me just clarify one thing. It has nothing to do with money missing. It has nothing to do with that.

Alderman Lopez replied I just wanted to know if there was a problem going on that we weren't aware of and people are making statements to me. I just wanted to clarify it.

Mr. Daneault responded there are a lot of allegations that I haven't seen any proof of yet.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Shea expressing concerns relating to marketing efforts of AT&T Broadband, suggesting clarification be made, and asking the Committee on Administration to review the situation on behalf of residents.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think Alderman Shea was making reference to an incident that happened in Ward 8. One of those people called me relative to a sub-contractor advising of wrongdoing by the contractor and the parties billing went up to...I forget the amount of money but I did call Jennifer Farrell. She addressed the problem and everything is under control.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Gatsas asked, Jennifer is this procedure done by sub-contractors. How is this working? How is somebody going in and telling people that they are representing AT&T Broadband?

Ms. Farrell answered with the launch of our digital product and how tight the job market is we have had to hire sub-contractors. We train them and we monitor them, but I do once in a great while get a complaint about one of our sub-

contractors and any time that we do get a complaint we take care of it immediately.

Chairman Gatsas stated this will probably be part of tomorrow's newspaper edition so we best get the facts very clear and very straight so that if anybody has had that problem we certainly have a sounding board that they can get back to because I think what they are assuming is that the digital system that is going to be put in place is not there as of yet, from what I understand, but it is in the future.

Ms. Farrell replied no. We do have a digital product now.

Chairman Gatsas asked when did that go into effect.

Ms. Farrell answered I think we launched it probably about a month ago.

Chairman Gatsas stated the understanding of somebody going in and upsetting a senior citizen is not something that AT&T Broadband is promoting, I assume.

Ms. Farrell replied I don't know that...we definitely have a marketing force that is making phone calls and asking if they are interested in us coming to their home. We do need to check signals and they come into your home once you arrange for a meeting and they do try to sell the product. It is a great product. We have a terrific amount of demand for it.

Chairman Gatsas asked but it is not being sold with the idea that they cannot get cable TV.

Ms. Farrell answered absolutely not. If it is, I need to know about that immediately.

Chairman Gatsas stated that is what I wanted to make sure that Gary gets across in the article that he is going to do tomorrow.

Ms. Farrell replied we have a zero tolerance policy in place.

Chairman Gatsas stated I am sure you do, but I think you need to be aware if somebody is doing that.

Ms. Farrell replied I totally agree with you. If we have a bad apple out there we want to get rid of it.

Alderman Hirschmann stated in Alderman Shea's letter it sounds like maybe one of the constituents is elderly and it says callers have informed me that sales people

are contacting them advising them of a need for residences to upgrade equipment for digital programming. So, they may be confused as to what it is thinking that it is something that they have to do when they don't have to do it. This is another tier of service and that is how it should be sold. You should say this is a higher tier of service that you don't have to use. People are confused and that is what the complaint is about.

Ms. Farrell replied I agree with you.

Alderman Lopez stated I went through this process to see what the situation was and the salesmen are coming into the homes and are selling the telephone and the computers and all you have to do is sign a form. He gets \$5 for every form he turns in to Broadband. When they do call, they asked me if I wanted digital and I said yes I will try it and they brought one box out and the salesman said...they were supposed to bring two boxes out but they said we are really loaded and we can only give one per family now. Then I asked the salesman to put it on my VCR and there was a lot of work involved so he ended up putting it on the other TV and he said you can get another one and then we will come back and put the other one up. They tried to sell through the process and I let him proceed and my wife was very intrigued about it and I can imagine some of the older people being guided to digital telephone, digital this and digital that and taking over computers and everything else so I agree on one hand about the marketing aspect. My bill went from \$65 to \$86 just for digital and I am in the process of going back to the basic plan right now. I just did it to go through the process so that I would have full knowledge of what is going on. I do agree with you. It is the salesmen because they are contracted by the cable company and they are there to make \$1. I wanted to give you that input.

Chairman Gatsas stated but I assume at no time did that salesman tell you that you couldn't get regular cable without the increase to digital.

Alderman Lopez replied no. At no time did he do that.

Chairman Gatsas stated I am concerned about the people who that salesman is telling that they can't get cable without digital. That is what I am concerned about. If you brought them in to find out about the process was that is fine. My concern is for the people who they may be telling you need to do this or you can't get cable TV.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Jennifer, are the phone marketing people or the sales people in the field employees of AT&T Broadband or sub-contractors.

Ms. Farrell answered they are sub-contractors. There is a mix, but we have a lot of safeguards in place. We train them. We monitor them and we do follow-up surveys. Again, if you were to hear anything like what you are telling me you heard, I would hope that you would contact me immediately.

Chairman Gatsas called for vote on the motion to receive and file this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Atty. Jennifer Farrell, Manager of Government Affairs for AT&T Broadband advising that the issue relating to Ms. Sandra Gray's technical problems have been resolved.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from AT&T Broadband advising of annual customer notices and submitting copies of inserts for customers bills as follows: Notice to Customers Regarding Policies; Complaint Procedures and Services; Notice to Customers regarding equipment compatibility; and Subscriber Privacy Notice.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to receive and file this item.

Alderman Pariseau asked could we request that the print be a little bigger, especially for the elderly citizens. I have trouble reading this the way it is. I know that it is a photocopy, but the elderly wouldn't be able to read it either.

Chairman Gatsas stated I assume these have already been printed.

Ms. Farrell replied they have all been printed and they are annual. I can always make that suggestion to them for the next year that I have gotten some feedback that the print should be bigger and I will definitely put that in as a suggestion.

Alderman Pariseau stated Jennifer if you go to the print that is under Item 8, Limited 30-Day Warranty and Limitations of Liability throughout the document is it readable. This isn't readable.

Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Hirschmann stated this is the last cable thing on the agenda but my question refers to the new contract that we signed and all of the parameters of that contract of putting drops in buildings and doing certain things for us. Could we go over that while she is here? Are those things getting done? There is a punch list of things that are supposed to occur with the new contract.

Ms. Farrell replied could I do some homework on that and come back.

Alderman Hirschmann stated as part of the agreement, Mr. Chairman, you of all people are aware that there is a list of things that they are supposed to perform within a short period of time.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated my understanding is in my conversations with Diane Prew and some communications I have had that all of the stops or drops I think except one have been installed. The one remaining one was to the JFK Coliseum. Highway indicated a preference for doing that in the spring as opposed to now which is why that drop has not been installed. I think we are on course with that. We had anticipated taking a bill of sale for the I-net, I believe, sometime last month but we don't want to do that until all of the drops are actually installed and the whole system has been tested to make sure it is working. As I said, we want to have all of the drops installed before we test the system and accept ownership of it.

Chairman Gatsas asked what about the disbursement.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered the disbursement of funds we have gotten in the checks that were called for by the contract. They have been given to Finance. Finance, I believe, has set-up a separate account for that. As far as I know, that is going according to plan. I have not heard otherwise. I am sure that Grace Sullivan would have given me a call if there was a problem.

Alderman Hirschmann stated MCTV people were telling me that they were having a bump problem on Channel 22. There is a problem with their broadcast signal. Do they have to act like they are a customer of AT&T and go through this policy or are we different because we are a broadcaster?

Chairman Gatsas asked what is a bump problem.

Alderman Hirschmann answered you know like Channel 9 used to come in all wavy. The new Channel 22 has a bumping picture they are telling me.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied I will check with Grace on that. I had not heard that, Alderman. I will do my best to check with her tomorrow and work out any problems that may be occurring.

Alderman Hirschmann asked, Alderman Levasseur, didn't the technician down there tell us that there is a problem with Channel 22.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes. They are saying that now instead of it being on Channel 9 where the problems were last year they are now coming onto Channel 22 and they said that there was another show or another station and I forget what the station was on Channel 22 but now that it is switched over to MCTV they are having the same problems.

Chairman Gatsas asked the Deputy Solicitor to send a letter to AT&T so that we can get a response.

Ms. Farrell answered actually David Scannell called me last week and I called Workforce Operations and they did come over and tested the signal because apparently it is happening when you are on live but when they come over they put it back to me. They said that David Scannell let them in and I haven't verified that yet if they are confused and they were told by MCTV that they weren't having a problem. So, I am not really sure whether it resolved itself or maybe they discovered something and fixed it but I definitely will call Workforce Operations tomorrow and send over somebody else to do some testing.

Chairman Gatsas asked can we get identification of people who were talked to.

Ms. Farrell answered sure.

Alderman Thibault stated I just want to make sure that Deputy Solicitor Arnold keeps us abreast as to when this is going to happen and keeps this Committee informed as to when all of the drops are in.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied certainly.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Donald Labbe requesting reimbursement from the City for business licensing and two taxi medallions fees which were issued to DJ Cab, Inc.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Matt, what is the good word with our taxicabs. How are we doing out there?

Mr. Normand answered I have had one complaint that I am working on at the moment from a fare in one of our cabs but outside of that, I haven't had any calls.

Alderman O'Neil asked when are the partitions mandatory by.

Mr. Normand answered April 30, 2001 or the next licensing period.

Alderman O'Neil asked and full-size cars the same day.

Mr. Normand answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked have you gotten any feedback way one or the other with regards to the partitions.

Mr. Normand answered just that, as I stated the last time we discussed this, it was somewhat cramped, however, at the time that we passed that we were more concerned with safety in light of the events that had happened previously.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we allow and I have seen this in some communities, do we allow the partition, I know the ones in the cab now are completely solid. Maybe there are little holes at the top but do we allow sliders if they wanted to buy a partition with a slider and then it was at the discretion of the driver.

Mr. Normand answered that was left...that part of the amendment was approved by the City Clerk's Office. It wasn't real specific. If that is what you guys would like, we certainly could do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated as I said the one night I went out and again it depends on which cab driver you are with but he was very personable and I did not feel uncomfortable riding with him and he did not have a partition whereas if you put a partition in his car it is going to lose a lot of that. I was just wondering if there was a way to compromise between the two situations.

Mr. Normand replied the way it was left is that the partition has to be approved by the City Clerk's Office so to allow for a slot...typically what they are is for the

money exchange, however, so I don't know that that accommodates conversation and that is the way they are manufactured.

Alderman O'Neil asked there are none that are manufactured with any kind of sliding...part of the partition slides at the discretion of the driver.

Mr. Normand answered I can look into that.

Alderman O'Neil replied it would be just curiosity more than anything.

Alderman Thibault stated some of these cab companies have already started to buy nice cars and they look really nice and I think it is a great improvement and hopefully they will all follow through on time.

TABLED ITEM

9. Communication from Alderman Lopez requesting that the Board of Assessors provide information over the next 60 to 90 days on processes for updating assessment of City properties.
(Tabled 9/18/00 pending report from Assessors.)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Gatsas stated at the State level today I found out some interesting facts. One, I think we should send a notice or directive to Diane Prew of Information Systems. I believe she is in charge of the phone bills. The Library and School Departments are entitled or have the availability of 90% discounts on phone lines that go to them through the Federal government. There needs to be some follow-up on how we get it. Also, I guess and I am sure we must participate in some and I don't know what Committee that should come out of by I thought that was a very interesting fact. If we can send her a communication, I can get you the young lady's name.

Clerk Bernier replied I will take care of that.

Chairman Gatsas stated there is between a 20% and 90% discount available on phones for schools and libraries. I don't know if we are participating in that. The other interesting fact I found out was that the municipality of the City has the ability to buy oil at the State's discounted rate and I don't know if we are already doing that.

Clerk Bernier replied I will do a follow-up on that, Mr. Chairman.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee